

## REMARKS

Claims 1-9, 12-22, 25-35, 38 and 39 are pending in this application. All of the pending claims were rejected. Claims 1, 14 and 27 are currently amended. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

All of the pending claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) based on Albert in view of McRae. The arguments in support of the rejections are substantially the same as those presented in the previous office action. The Office concedes that Albert does not teach that one field of a data packet is processed in parallel by multiple filter operations, but asserts that McRae does so. Applicant had argued that, in McRae, each field is entered into only one lookup table, which differs from the claimed invention which would enter the same field into multiple lookup tables for parallel filtering, assuming lookup tables were being used for filtering. In response to this argument, the Office states at page 9 of the final office action that the “packet header” of McRae is interpreted by the Examiner to be “one field of the data packet.” It is Applicant’s understanding that a packet header is not a field, but rather a collection of fields such as a source address field and a destination address field, along with various other fields. The claims have been amended to clarify this by reciting that the data packet has a header with a plurality of data fields, and that it is one field of the data packet header that is processed in parallel with multiple filter operations. Support for these changes is in the Specification at page 14 under the heading “Filter Operation on Data Packets.” For example, the source address and destination address fields are described in connection with Figures 8 through 12 as examples of the at least one field of the data packet to which multiple filter rules are applied simultaneously (or near the same time). Withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1, 14 and 27 based on the combination of Albert in view of McRae is therefore requested.

If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is also nonobvious. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Claims 2-9, 12-13, 15-22, 25-26, 28-35, 38 and 39 are dependent claims which further distinguish the inventions, and which are allowable for the same reasons as their respective base claims. Withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-9, 12-22, 25-35, 38 and 39 based on Albert in view of McRae is therefore also requested.

For these reasons, and in view of the above amendments, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. Should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned, Applicants' Attorney at 978-264-4001 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully Submitted,

11/7/2006  
Date

/Holmes W. Anderson/  
Holmes W. Anderson, Reg. No. 37272  
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)  
McGuinness & Manaras LLP  
125 Nagog Park  
Acton, MA 01720  
(978) 264-4001

Docket No. 120-098